

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. Additionally, Figures 1 and 2 have been objected to as well as Claims 1, 4, 8, and 9. By this amendment, Claims 1, 7, 8 and 9 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections in light of the following remarks.

The present Office Action objected to Figures 1 and 2 as allegedly failing to show proper legends. The Applicant, however, is unclear as to what legends have been allegedly omitted and, thus, traverses this objection since it is unclear how the drawings are to be cured. Additionally, all of the elements in Figures 1 and 2 are appropriately labeled in order to fulfill the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that further information be provided in the next Office Action as to what legends are allegedly missing.

Additionally, Figure 1 has been objected to and asserted that it should be labeled with "Prior Art." The amendment to this drawing is believed to address and resolve this objection.

Claim 9 has been objected to based on the assertion that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term "the primary resources" found in this claim. The amendment to this claim is believed to address and resolve this objection.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 have been objected to based on the assertion that the acronym "CTI" should be written out as complete phrase instead as in an acronym. In response, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to spell out this acronym. Amendment to the term CTI in claims 4 and 9 is believed to be unnecessary as the term and an acronym have been related to one another in amended claims 1 and 8, respectively. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be addressed and resolved.

Claim 7 was objected to based on the assertion that the limitation " S_0 " should be written out and qualified as an interface. The amendment to this claim is believed to address and resolve this objection.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,602). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that Walker discloses all of the elements of claim 6 including the claimed feature of “control equipment for controlling the digital switching system and initiating the exchange of digital communication data between the digital recording system and the digital switching system and configured to ensure control command to mirror the communication connection between a first and second users between a virtual terminal associated with the digital switching system and the digital recording system.” The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion and submits that Walker does not indeed teach or suggest all of the elements, including these elements, of the claims. In particular, Walker does not teach or suggest control equipment for controlling a digital switching system and initiating exchange of digital communication between a digital recording system and the digital switching system as featured in this claim. Furthermore, Walker does not teach or suggest a control equipment also “configured to issue a control command to mirror the communication connection between the first and second users between a virtual terminal associated with the digital switching system and the digital recording system” as featured in this claim. Instead, Walker merely discloses granting at least one party excess to record at audio communication data through the use of a cryptographic key and unique access code. The referenced teaching (i.e., Col. 7, lines 1-2) in no way teaches the mirroring of a communication connection between the party 1 and party 2 of Walker. It is merely a recording. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Walker does not teach or suggest the particular claimed elements of claim 6.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker et al. in view of Garcia (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,247). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Walker teaches all of the elements of the claim except for a CTI connection between a control system and a switching system. Garcia is relied upon as allegedly teaching this missing connection. Nonetheless, the Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that all of the elements of claim 4 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Walker and Garcia. In particular, the combination of Walker and Garcia does not teach the claimed element of “in response to the CTI call message, caused by the control system, mirroring the communication connection between the first user and the second user onto a communication connection between a virtual terminal associated with the

digital switching system and the digital recording system for at least one of transferring digital communication to and storing digital communication data in the digital recording system.” Instead, Walker, merely grants at least one calling party access to a recorded audio communication data through the use of the cryptographic key and unique access code. Walker does not teach or even contemplate responding to a CTI call message in a way that a communication connection between the first and second parties is mirrored onto a communication connection between a virtual terminal associated with a digital switching system and a digital recording system. As discussed above with respect to claim 6, Walker simply provides access to an audio vault 12 as illustrated in Figure 1A, not “mirroring the communication connection between a first and second user onto a communication connection between a virtual terminal” as featured in claim 1. Moreover, Garcia fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the elements of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Walker and Garcia, either combined or taken separately, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn accordingly.

With respect to independent claims 2-5 and 8 and 9, the Applicant submits that these claims are allowable on the merits and at least for the reasons presented above with respect to dependent claims 1 or 6.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker as applied to claim 6 in view of Weishut et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,047,057). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is allowable on its merits and for the reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 6.

Finally, claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker as applied to claim 6 in view of Waugh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,402). These claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and at least for the reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 6.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: June 18, 2003